

Appl. No. 09/663,554
Amdt. dated December 23, 2003
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2154

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

New claims 21-23 have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-23 are present for examination. No new matter is added by these amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Prasad et al.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,381 to Prasad et al. (hereinafter "Prasad"). To maintain a valid obviousness rejection of the amended claims, among other things, the Office must show that each and every limitation from the claims appears in Prasad. Applicants believe major limitations from claims 1, 8 and 15 are neither taught nor suggested in Prasad. More specifically, Prasad cannot be relied on to teach or suggest: (1) a directory listing content objects identified by content object class as required by claims 1, 8 and 15; (2) use of a timer as required by claims 8 and 15; or, (3) performing reporting of the directory in response to detecting a timer value as required by claim 15. Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

Prasad relates to a distributed database that can be updated in a peer-to-peer manner between various database replicas 109. See Prasad, col. 3, lines 13-24. The objects in the database are of various types, such as printers, users, servers, and applications, but the objects are not classified based upon their content. See Prasad, col. 8, lines 24-26. Synchronizing a distributed database is a significant problem, but is dealt with by using timestamps. See Id., col. 3, lines 46-51. The timestamps merely indicate a time that the directory changed and do not have anything to do with timers. See Id., col. 13, line 58 through col. 14, line 2.

The claimed invention, as embodied, addresses a global directory that stores directory portions reported by various web sites around a network. The global directory and the directory portions are required by the claims to index content objects that have their content categorized by content object class. Prasad only indicates the type of object and says nothing

Appl. No. 09/663,554
Amdt. dated December 23, 2003
Amendment under 37 CFR, 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2154

PATENT

about its substance or class. Further, claims 8 and 15 use a timer, for example, to know when to report the directory to the global directory. By doing this on a schedule, synchronization overhead is reduced. Prasad only uses timestamps to resolve coherency of the distributed database.

For at least the forgoing reasons, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is urged. Reconsideration of the claims in their current form is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas D. Franklin
Reg. No. 43,616

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
TDF:cmb
60072763 v1